

out. I reserve the remainder of the time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY FRENCH PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 2 minutes in order to allow the Senate to greet a French parliamentary delegation that is visiting us.

RECESS

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:54 p.m., recessed until 4:01 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KEMPTHORNE).

NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT AMENDMENTS—MOTION TO PROCEED

The Senate continued with the consideration of the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield myself 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, let me respond to a number of things brought up by my friend, the manager of this bill.

First of all, he is right about nuclear power. It produces a lot of electricity in the United States. But everyone recognizes those days are numbered. The average life expectancy of nuclear power in the United States is 15 years. After that it is going to be gone.

As I indicated yesterday, it might be 25 years with one of the reactors and it may 5 years with another. But nuclear power is all through in this country. It simply is too dangerous, and everyone knows that.

I will also speak to the question of what to do with spent fuel. That question has been raised. Senator BRYAN and I continually answer the question. It is very easy. We should leave it where it is—capsulated in the spent fuel rods kept in dry cask containers.

As Senator BRYAN mentioned today and I mentioned yesterday, there would be no fire that would damage the dry cask storage containers as would happen in a diesel truck or train. There would be no accident that would occur driving at speeds that would rupture the casks. It is safe and it is cheap. That is what should be done with nuclear waste for the foreseeable future.

I will also state, Mr. President, that the question still has never been answered: What about the environmental groups? Hundreds of them oppose this legislation—not two or three, not 20 or a couple score, but hundreds that are now a part of the record.

No question has ever been answered as to why these environmental groups

oppose the legislation. They oppose the legislation because it is dangerous for the environment. It would be different if there was an equal balance, half of them supported it and half of them did not. Every one of them—it is exclusive—all environmental groups oppose this legislation.

Let me also say, Mr. President, one of the things being lost in this debate is the fact that as we speak hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent in characterizing the repository at Yucca Mountain to determine if in fact that site is going to be scientifically safe for storage of nuclear waste. I repeat, this past year hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent. Next year the same—hundreds of millions of dollars will be spent characterizing that site.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that this legislation is a way to avoid the permanent repository. The very powerful, greedy nuclear industry that is promulgated by the utilities, basically what they want to do is short-circuit the present system. They do not want to take their chances at Yucca Mountain in having a safe, scientifically characterized site. They want to circumvent the system. They want to do away with environmental laws. They want to void the present law that says you cannot have temporary storage in the same State where a permanent site is being considered.

Why have we not heard anything about Yucca Mountain? That used to be the big debate. Because the nuclear industry wants to avoid Yucca Mountain. They want to do it the cheap way.

We have heard raised continually the fact that Nevada used to be a place where they set off bombs, atmospheric tests and underground tests, and more than 900, almost 1,000 of those tests have been detonated.

As I stated, the State of Nevada has sacrificed significantly for that. We did it because there were hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands of nuclear warheads pointed at the State of Nevada and the United States. Conversely, the United States of America pointed their weapons at the Soviet Union. The cold war has terminated. I repeat, this ended a dangerous era. It was a time of national crisis. We were all called upon to do what was necessary to protect this country. The State of Nevada did its share. We did what was right at a time of crisis.

The time has come now, though, to understand that that was then and this is now. There is presently no danger that would drive us to endanger our environment or public by reckless and ill-conceived actions. That is what this legislation is.

There is no nuclear waste crisis that any objective and competent study has been able to uncover. The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board has testified to the lack of urgency and crisis with respect to moving spent nuclear fuel from its generation sites. The chairman of the board, under the direction of this Congress, testified last

year, and now the new chairman this year, that "There is no urgent, technical or safety reason to move spent fuel to a centralized storage facility." So there is no emergency.

Moreover, existing contamination from early nuclear tests is not at all comparable to the potential contamination from premature and reckless storage of spent nuclear fuel in Nevada.

Mr. President, one transportation container of spent nuclear fuel contains about the same amount of radioactive waste as 200 nuclear tests. One transportation container that will travel through the State of Colorado and many other States in this country contains the same amount of radioactive waste as from 200 nuclear tests.

We are contemplating more than 15,000 shipments of spent nuclear fuel. Some of these shipments will have two containers. So more than 3,000 times the amount of contamination from the nuclear testing program—3,000 times as much would be stored in the repository.

Measured another way, each nuclear explosion generates 125 pounds of radioactive material per megaton of yield. The average yield of tests conducted in Nevada is much less than the maximum yield permitted under the limited test ban treaty. Assuming the average yield to be about 85 kilotons, the total testing program in Nevada would have generated only about 5 tons of radioactive waste.

They are trying to move, with this cheap legislation, 70,000 tons of nuclear waste to Nevada. So anyone who compares the nuclear tests in Nevada, which build up 5 tons of radioactive waste, are either exaggerating, deceiving the American public, or do not know what they are talking about.

And anyone who wants can make their choice of the three. The fact is, scientifically, we have 5 tons of radioactive waste compared to 70,000 tons that they are going to try to haul along the railways and highways of this Nation.

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that entities—cities, municipalities, counties—throughout this country have passed resolutions saying: Do not bring it through our cities.

Complete and enduring isolation of this highly radioactive material is necessary if we are to avoid many times the danger and damage caused by the nuclear testing program.

Mr. President, there has also been a lot of debate on this floor about onsite storage of spent nuclear fuel: It is going to break the country. It is going to break the power generating companies.

Well, let me just say this. This is, for lack of a better description, a scare tactic. It has no foundation in fact. Those who are propounding this have dismissed any thought of risk to the environment or to public health and safety, and any mention of such risk is waved away as scare tactics.

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board—remember we keep referring to